UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,568	05/19/2005	Roberto Sammartin	C&P-145US	7458
23122 RATNERPRES	7590 09/10/2007 STIA		EXAM	INER
P O BOX 980		ROSS, DANA		
VALLEY FOR	GE, PA 19482-0980		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3722	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/535,568	SAMMARTIN ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Dana Ross	3722	
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communic or Reply	ation appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence	e address
WHI - Extended aftended - If N - Fail Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MA ensions of time may be available under the provisions of it SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commun to period for reply is specified above, the maximum stature ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply with reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a nication. story period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI ill, by statute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of t BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)	his communication.
Status	(a)			
111⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 02 May 2006		
' =	,	o)⊠ This action is non-final.		
, —	Since this application is in condition for	<i>'</i> —	tters, prosecution as to	the merits is
	closed in accordance with the practice	e under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposi	tion of Claims			
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the ap	plication.		
, –	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are			
5)[	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1,5,8,17 and 18</u> is/are rejected	ed.		
7)⊠	Claim(s) 2-4,6,7 and 9-16 is/are object	ted to.		
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction			
Applicat	tion Papers			
9)	The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.		
10)🖂	The drawing(s) filed on 19 May 2005 is	s/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ obje	cted to by the Examine	er.
,	Applicant may not request that any objecti	on to the drawing(s) be held in abeya	ince. See 37 CFR 1.85(a	ı).
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	= ' '		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to be	· ·	• • •	, ,
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo D⊠ All b) Some * c) None of:	r foreign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
	1. Certified copies of the priority de	ocuments have been received.		•
	2. Certified copies of the priority do	ocuments have been received in A	Application No	
	3. Copies of the certified copies of	the priority documents have beer	n received in this Natio	nal Stage
	application from the International			
*	See the attached detailed Office action		t received.	
Attachme	nt(s)			
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT0 rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PT0/SB/08)	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application	
a) 🖂 inio	er No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/19/05</u> .	6)  Other:		

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Specification

1. Examiner notes the substitute specification and abstract filed 2 May 2006 has been entered. No new matter was incorporated.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1, 5, 8, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat. No. 4,782,567 (Kanaya et al.).

Kanaya teaches a machining line 10, wheel stocker 12, pick-up robot 14, transfer device 16, plural machining stations with loading robots, transfer device 16 (see col. 4, lines 48-63), turning means (see col. 3, lines 20-24 and col. 8, lines 28-62, for example), plural machining units 320a with turret tool holders 336a which include boring (drilling) tools (see col. 9, lines 36-56, for example)

Regarding claims 1 and 8, in the event that Applicant asserts that a boring does not include the use of a drill, Applicant is referred to the below 103 obvious rejection which expressly discloses that it is well known in the art to have machine tools of the type employed for drilling, boring, facing and similar operations.

Regarding claims 17 and 18, it is further noted that Kanaya teaches the machining of wheels. It is further noted that the limitations of the material of the wheel being made of an

Art Unit: 3722

"alloy" is directed towards the intended use of the machine on a particular material of a workpiece, not the structure of the equipment for mechanical machining of workpieces.

In the event Applicant asserts that the limitations of the alloy wheel provides for limitations for the structure of the machine, Applicant is referred to the below 103 obvious rejection as to the use of different materials.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanaya.
   Kanaya teaches all aspects of claims 1 and 8 as discussed above.

Kanaya teaches the machining of wheels but does not expressly disclose the workpieces are "alloy wheels".

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the machining equipment as taught by Kanaya on alloy wheels or any other material wheels, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a mater of obvious design choice. In this instance, it would be obvious to use the machining equipment of Kanaya to machine alloy wheels to increase their product base and increase the production capability in the supply of wheels.

Application/Control Number: 10/535,568 Page 4

Art Unit: 3722

6. Claims 1, 5, 8, 17 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanaya in view of US Pat. No. 1,838,995 (Johnson et al.).

Re Claims 1, 5 and 8 - See above 35 USC 102(b) rejections.

Re Claims 17 and 18, see above 35 USC 103(a) rejections.

In the event that Applicant does not agree that the machining operation of boring includes a drilling tool, Johnson expressly discloses that it is well known in the art to have machine tools which commonly employ one or more tool-carrying spindles with drilling, boring, facing and similar tools (see col. 1, lines 1-13, for example).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the generic boring operation of Kanaya to include various well known machining tools as taught by Johnson including drilling, boring, facing and similar operations for the purpose of having a machine tool that is capable of rapid and easy adjustment and having a low manufacturing cost (see Johnson, col. 1, lines 14-49, for example).

#### Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 2-4, 6, 7 and 9-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/535,568 Page 5

Art Unit: 3722

#### Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dana Ross whose telephone number is 571-272-4480. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Monica Carter can be reached on 571-272-4475. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dana Ross/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3722